

REMARKS:

Claims 6 and 8-9 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent JP 10321842A (hereinafter "JP '842") to Isohata et al. Figs. 2A and 2B are noted as the apparent basis for rejection.

Applicant does not have an abstract translated in the English language for the cited Japanese patent. However, U.S. Patent 6,054,736 to Shigehara et al. claims foreign priority from the aforementioned Japanese patent. Applicant will therefore refer to the corresponding '736 patent for ease of understanding and assumes that since the drawings between the two references are the same, that the description is the same. The Examiner is invited to point out any differences between the two references.

Applicant has rewritten claims 6 and 8 for improving clarity. Claims 6 and 8 now recite "a first region of a first conductivity type and, adjoining thereto, a second region of the second, opposite, conductivity type." The recitation is supported by the specification at page 3, lines 31-34. Claims 6 and 8 further recite "a third region of the first conductivity type, which is adjacent the second region and separated from the first region only by the second region." This recitation is clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that the '736 patent and its foreign counterpart fail to teach limitations recited by amended claim 6 of applicant's invention.

First, claim 6, as amended, recites "A semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor body having a first region of a first conductivity type and, adjoining thereto, a second region of the second, opposite, conductivity type." Referring to Figs. 2A and 2B, first region 12a is separated from second region 1 by region 8a. As stated

in col. 7, lines 33-35, "a source-side n^- -diffusion layer region 8a is formed so as to surround an n^+ -diffusion layer region 12a. Therefore, since first region 12a and second region 1 do not meet at any point, they are not adjoining as recited in amended claim 6.

Next, claim 6 as amended, recites "a third region of the first conductivity type, which is adjacent the second region and separated from the first region only by the second region." According to the Examiner, a third region 8b of the first conductivity (n) type is "separated from the first region 12a by the second region 1." However, second region 1 is not the only region separating the first and third regions. Third region 8b is also separated from first region 12a by source region 8a. The third region 8b is not separated from the first region 12a only by second region 1 as recited in amended claim 6.

Accordingly, the '736 patent fails to teach several of the limitations recited in claim 6 of applicant's invention. Therefore, it is believed that its corresponding Japanese patent fails to teach the same claimed limitations. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is not anticipated by JP '842.

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over JP '842 in view of U.S. Patent 5,578,859 to Wondrak et al. The Examiner states that Isohata et al. does not disclose that the semiconductor device is of the RESURF type, but that "Wondrak et al. discloses a semiconductor device with a third region of the first conductivity type, which is adjacent the second region and separated from the first region by the second region, that forms a drift region of a lateral DMOS transistor."

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed because JP '842 does not

teach several limitations recited in claim 8 of applicant's invention. The failure to teach these limitations is explained in the discussion above with respect to the failure of JP '842 to teach limitations recited in claim 6 because the limitations of claim 8 are substantially the same as those of claim 6. Claim 8 only recites the additional limitation that the device is of the RESURF type.

Moreover, because JP '842 fails to teach several of the limitations recited in claim 8, and Wondrak '859 likewise does not teach those same limitations, claim 8 is not made obvious.

Also, it is not clear from the Examiner's description which regions of the Wondrak '859 patent are considered to be the first region and second region. The third region has been designated by the Examiner as drift zone 4, but is surrounded by a variety of regions.

Nor has the Examiner shown that the first region has a first conductivity type, that the second region has a second, opposite conductivity type, or that the third region has the first conductivity type. The third region drift zone 4 is surrounded by an insulating layer 9, metalization layers 13, and a dielectric layer 3, none of which carry any specific conductivity type according to the specification. The first, second, and third regions of the semiconductor in the Wondrak '859 patent must have the same first and second conductivity types as recited in claim 8, in order to make claim 8 obvious from JP '842 in view of Wondrak '859. Otherwise, there is no teaching or suggestion that the first, second and third regions of the JP '842 semiconductor device can be used in the completely different Wondrak '859 semiconductor device.


Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for

allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain which may be resolved by telephonic communication, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, if such will advance the application to allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Yan Glickberg
Reg. No. 51,742
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: September 29, 2003

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706